

### **Remarks**

The following will address each of the rejections raised in the current Office Action. In view of the above Amendments to the Claims, and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1, 5 and 8-10.

#### **A. Rejection of Claims 4 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1**

In the current Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1. Specifically, the Examiner explains that the specification (in the Example underlying Claims 4 and 7) recite disodium EDTA being present in an amount of “0.1% by volume,” whereas the previously presented claims recited a range of 0.04-0.06%, which the Examiner contends is not adequately described in the specification.

As explained below, Applicant has merged the limitations of dependent Claim 4 into independent Claim 1 and, in doing so, modified the recited quantity of disodium EDTA to “0.1% by volume.” Likewise, Applicant has merged the limitations of dependent Claim 7 into independent Claim 5 and, in doing so, modified the recited quantity of disodium EDTA to “0.1% by volume.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that in view of the foregoing amendments, Claims 1 and 5 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1.

#### **B. Rejection of Claims 1-10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶2**

In the current Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶2. Specifically, the Examiner explains that the recited components of such Claims, when added together, form 99.22% to 99.78% by volume of the recited composition.

In response, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 5, to modify the amount of water (solvent) present from 92-95% to 92-96%. In other words, Applicant has added an extra 1% to the amount of water that may be used. As such, the sum of the recited constituents may now equal 100% of the recited composition. Applicant states that written support exists for this amendment in paragraph [0021] of the present application (reciting a water / solvent range of 92-95%) and paragraph [0063] (explaining that the recited percentages may vary within a range of plus or minus 20%). In addition, those of ordinary skill in the art would understand that any deficit in the total volume required to form a recited composition would be filled with solvent (in this case, water).

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1, 5 and 8-10 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112¶2.

**C. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has maintained the rejections of Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being obvious in view of several prior art references discussed therein. The Examiner has withdrawn the rejection of the previously presented Claims 4 and 7 under § 103(a).

In response, Applicant has merged the limitations of dependent Claim 4 into independent Claim 1; and has merged the limitations of dependent Claim 7 into independent Claim 5. Applicant has canceled Claims 2-4 and 6-7. In view of the foregoing, Applicant contends that Claims 1 and 5 are now in a condition for allowance, as well as Claims 8-10 (which depend from Claim 5).

**D. Conclusion**

In view of the Amendments to the Claims and the Remarks above, Applicant respectfully requests that the current rejections under §§ 112 and 103 be withdrawn, and that Claims 1, 5 and 8-10 be allowed to issue.